DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

GRAY DAVIS, GOVERNOR
STATE CAPITOL ■ ROOM 1145 ■ SACRAMENTO CA ■ 95814-4998 ■ WWW.DOF.CA.GOV

REPORT ON VACANT POSITIONS
MAY 2000

OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

Background

The Department of Finance (DOF) analyzed the vacant positions of 29 of the largest State agencies to determine the causes of vacancies in State government. In doing so, we tried to determine if high vacancy rates among State agencies are related to (a) the lack of funding for merit salary adjustments and price increases, (b) budgeted salary savings rates that are excessive, (c) recruitment problems caused by non-competitive State salaries, or (d) factors within the control of State agencies. We also tried to determine the impact on State agencies and programs if the Legislature were to eliminate the vacant positions and associated funding from State agency budgets.

We concentrated on the largest State agencies (but excluded higher education agencies and the two State pension funds from our review) because they are responsible for most of the vacant positions in State government. In 1998-99, for example, the 29 departments we selected (all of which had at least 1,000 authorized positions during that year) accounted for almost 85 percent of all State agency vacancies. These departments are listed in Table 3, below.

For each of the 29 selected departments, we collected ten years of expenditure and position data from the Governor's Budgets and Salaries and Wages Supplements. We used the mid-year budget for authorized personnel years and expenditures and used the past-year actual budget figures for actual expenditures and positions filled. The period covered by our data collection effort is 1989-90 to 1998-99, the last year for which past-year actual figures are currently available.

Summary of Findings[1]

During the past 10 years, vacancies in State departments (excluding higher education) have averaged 9.7 percent of total authorized positions. Vacancies attributable to budgeted salary

[1] The statewide totals presented in this summary are from the printed Governor's Budget. For the 29 largest departments, the data are from the printed Governor's Budget, as adjusted for caseload and other significant changes that occurred after the Governor's Budget was released. (See the first bullet under "Interpreting the Data" for a discussion of these changes.) In total, the adjustments reduced the 29 departments' 1997-98 authorized positions and excess vacancies by about 140 positions, increased their total authorized salaries and wages by about $15 million, and increased their excess salaries and wages savings by about $14 million. For 1998-99, the adjustments reduced the departments' authorized positions and vacancies by about 420 positions, increased their total authorized salaries and wages by $74 million, and increased their excess salaries and wages savings by about $109 million. For other years, only minor adjustments attributable to May Revision population changes for the Department of Corrections and the Employment Development Department were made.

savings have averaged about 4.9 percent of authorized positions, and "excess vacancies" (i.e., vacancies in excess of positions held vacant to meet budgeted salary savings) have averaged 4.8 percent. Salaries and wages dollar savings resulting from excess vacancies have averaged 1.7 percent of net authorized salaries and wages.

Although there have been year-to-year fluctuations in vacancies, recent vacancy rates tend to be on the high end of the range experienced during the 10 years. (See Table 1.) In 1998-99, there were 21,790 total vacancies, resulting in a vacancy rate of 10.5 percent, and 11,962 excess vacancies (a 5.8 percent rate). Salaries and wages savings resulting from excess vacancies in 1998-99 were $205 million (2.2 percent) statewide.

Among the 29 departments analyzed by the DOF, total vacancies over the last 10 years averaged 9.7 percent of total authorized positions, and excess vacancies averaged 4.7 percent of authorized personnel years. Salaries and wages dollar savings have averaged 1.4 percent of net authorized salary and wages dollars. In 1998-99, there were 18,743 total vacancies (10.3 percent) and 9,891 excess vacancies (5.4 percent). Salaries and wages savings were $248 million (3.0 percent) across the 29 departments. (See Table 2.)

Vacancy rates among the 29 departments differ substantially, with some departments experiencing average vacancy rates as high as 18 percent over the 10 years and other departments experiencing average vacancy rates as low as 4.3 percent. (See Table 3.)

Of the 18,743 vacant positions in the 29 departments in 1998-99, 8,852 (47 percent) were needed to meet the departments' budgeted salary savings, 3,464 (18 percent) were needed to fund the higher cost of filled positions (see the discussion under "Discrepancy Between Position Vacancy and Dollar Savings Rates"), 2,804 (15 percent) were needed to fund additional overtime, and 2,024 (11 percent) were vacant because anticipated revenue, primarily federal funds and reimbursements, did not materialize (see discussion under "Interpreting the Data"). After accounting for these factors, only 1,599 (9 percent) of the vacancies generated dollar savings that were reverted or redirected for other purposes.[2] (See Table 4.)

Some of the positions that were vacant during 1998-99 already have been eliminated by the administration or have been proposed for elimination in the 2000-01 Governor's Budget. In total, the 29 departments have eliminated, or proposed to eliminate, 1,840 positions that were vacant during 1998-99. Many of these positions were limited-term positions that could not be filled during 1998-99 because program implementation was delayed or because anticipated revenue or workload never materialized. These limited-term positions expired, and were not renewed, since June 30, 1999 or are due to expire on June 30, 2000. In other

[2] These proportions vary greatly among departments and fluctuate substantially from year to year. For example, in 1996-97, of the 15,042 vacancies among the 29 departments, 8,791 (59 percent) were needed to meet the departments' budgeted salary savings, 1,405 (9 percent) were needed to fund the higher cost of filled positions and 2,327 (15 percent) were needed to fund additional overtime. The remaining excess vacancies totaled 2,327 (17 percent of total authorized positions). It is not known how many of the positions were vacant due to revenue that failed to materialize at the budgeted level.

cases, departments have reexamined their workload needs and the funding they might reasonably expect to receive from the federal government or from reimbursements and have proposed eliminating the positions during the budget development process. We also found that several departments that received a significant number of new positions during 1998-99 for new programs or program expansions and who were unable to increase their recruitment efforts quickly enough to fill their new positions during 1998-99 have documented a significant decrease in their excess vacancies during 1999-00.[3]

Historical Context

Departments were subjected to substantial General Fund reductions during the early to mid-1990s. These include a one percent reduction in 1990-91, a "trigger" reduction in 1991-92 averaging more than 8 percent of departments' General Fund budgets (excluding the Department of Corrections and higher education), and various unallocated reductions in 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1995-96. There also were statewide reductions to managers, supervisors and administration in 1995-96, and some departments incurred selective reductions after 1995-96. Departments also have had to "absorb" the costs of various employee compensation increases during the 1990's. For example, only 15 departments received funding for the 3 percent salary increase provided in 1994-95. Other departments were forced to absorb this cost. In other years, some benefit enhancements or increases in the employer costs of existing benefits were not funded by the State, and departments generally have had to absorb the cost of recruitment and retention pay differentials that have been adopted by the State to make State salaries more competitive. Departments did not receive funding for price increases in operating costs or for merit salary adjustments, though exceptions were made in some cases, e.g. for revenue producing departments and for the Department of Corrections. These policies required departments to make many changes in their modes of operation, including administrative and program reductions. Many departments held vacant a number of positions for which there was no funding, though many departments eventually eliminated some or all of their unfunded positions.

From time to time, vacant positions also have increased because of hiring freezes. A hiring freeze was imposed on State departments from November 19, 1990 through December 5, 1997. The freeze applied to hires for which employees were new to State service, and exempted 24-hour institutions, revenue producing entities and emergency service functions. During the later years of the hiring freeze, criteria for approving freeze exemptions were generally much less stringent than in the earlier years. Some departments imposed their own hiring freezes in addition to the statewide freeze either during, before or after the period of the statewide freeze.

With the lifting of the hiring freeze, departments are now in a position to hire and fill vacancies. However, many departments are now finding that State salaries are not competitive or that there are labor shortages in the positions they need to fill.

---

[3] Information on these reductions is detailed in the companion document, which contains our findings pertaining to specific departments.

Discrepancy Between Position Vacancy and Dollar Savings Rates

One of the findings of our analysis is that vacancy rates are higher than the salaries and wages savings rates. In other words, a 10 percent vacancy rate does not result in a 10 percent savings in salaries and wages but a savings that is significantly less than 10 percent. It appears that the primary reasons for the disparity between vacancy rates and salaries and wages savings rates are that departments spend significantly more per filled position than they budget for each authorized position and that many departments spend substantially more than they budget on overtime.

Some of the reasons departments may be spending more per filled position than they budget are:

- Vacant positions often are filled above the bottom steps of the salary ranges for the classifications (e.g., when employees transfer from other departments or are newly hired at above minimum step), whereas a department's vacant positions, by State policy, are budgeted at the bottom steps of their respective salary ranges.[4]
- Positions are reclassified to higher-paying positions without offsetting reclassifications to lower-paying positions.
- Departments must make lump-sum payments to employees for bonuses or premium payments, vacation buyouts at separation, certain disability payments, and personal leave program buyouts. These items are generally unanticipated and unbudgeted. However, they are included in departments' actual expenditures on salaries and wages and therefore affect the calculation of amount spent per position filled.
- Vacancy rates among lower-level positions are higher than those among higher-level positions. This is likely to occur in most departments, if for no other reason, because higher-level positions normally are filled relatively quickly by promotions from within the department, whereas lower-level (e.g., entry-level) positions normally are filled after extensive recruitment procedures have been followed.
- Some collectively-bargained employee compensation increases have not been funded by the State. These include the 1994-95 general salary increase, employee pay differentials negotiated through the collective bargaining process, and several negotiated benefit increases that occurred during the 1990's.

[4] When a position becomes vacant, under the State's personnel and budget policies, the State Controller's payroll system records the position's salary at the bottom step of the salary range for the position's classification. The authorized salaries and wages for a department's budgeted positions are determined from the State Controller's payroll records as of June 30 of the past year for the budget being prepared. Every position that is vacant on June 30 of the prior year therefore is budgeted at the bottom step of the position's salary range. There is nothing (other than limitations on available funds) that prohibits a department from filling a vacant position at a salary in excess of the bottom step. However, if a department fills most of its vacant positions at salaries exceeding the bottom steps of the ranges, it will need to find a source of funds to do so because State budget policies do not provide augmentations for such actions. The most likely source of funds is holding other positions vacant.

In some cases, departments spend less per position filled than they budget for those positions. Usually, this occurs when departments spend more on low-cost temporary help positions than they anticipated spending when they prepared their budgets. However, it also can occur if turnover among higher-salaried employees is greater than normal and the department hires replacement employees at lower salaries.

Reasons for Excess Vacancies

The Department of Finance found that several factors contribute to vacant positions, including:

- As noted in the above section, departments generally pay more per filled position than they budget for each authorized position. To do so, they must hold many positions vacant. In 1998-99, about 18 percent of all vacancies in the 29 largest departments were attributable to this factor.
- The inability of departments to compete for employees with the private sector and local government (and sometimes with other State agencies) in selected classifications, such as information technology classifications, health and science professionals, social workers, auditors, investigators and law enforcement officers. This factor, and the factor described in the next paragraph, usually leads to the increased use of overtime and sometimes to the increased use of personal services contracts to obtain staff needed to undertake departments' workload. In 1998-99, the 29 largest departments incurred overtime expenditures of about $80 million more than they had budgeted and purchased the equivalent of 2,804 personnel years with those funds. This is equivalent to 15 percent of the departments' vacancies during 1998-99.
- The inability of departments to compete with the private sector or local government in selected geographic areas, mostly the Bay Area and Los Angeles. It is also difficult to attract employees to rural areas (e.g., nurses in Barstow for the Veterans' Home).
- Departments are unable to fill positions if funding does not materialize, as sometimes occurs with federal funds, reimbursements or special funds that receive less revenue than budgeted. In 1998-99, about 11 percent of all vacancies in the 29 largest departments were attributable to this factor.
- Departments with population-driven staffing do not fill all authorized positions if population does not increase as anticipated.
- Some departments have a relatively large number of limited-term positions. Limited-term positions appear to have higher vacancy rates, because it is difficult to hire and retain employees in these positions.
- A large number of new positions to expand a program or initiate a new program generally causes a temporary increase in the vacancy rate. This is especially true where departments' recruitment capabilities are inadequate to hire a large number of new

employees in a short period of time, as often is the case for departments that have recently experienced reductions in authorized positions.

- Late budgets can affect a department's ability to fill new positions. Late State budgets do not appear to have a significant effect on the department's vacancy rate unless the department receive a large number of new positions. Several departments indicated that late federal budgets, or late federal budget reductions, had an impact on their vacancy rates. We did not receive sufficient information from departments to verify this assertion.
- Some departments deliberately hold positions vacant to cover shortfalls in operating expenses. This sometimes has a compounding effect as departments meet unfunded costs by holding positions vacant in support areas, including personnel. Administrative vacancies, particularly in the personnel office, can result in problems with recruiting, testing, hiring, processing and other functions that make it difficult to fill other positions.
- Some departments hold positions vacant to meet unallocated reductions or to provide funds for merit salary adjustments or price increases that have not been funded by the State. During the early and mid-1990s, many departments received unallocated General Fund reductions and were forced to eliminate positions or hold positions vacant to stay within their authorized expenditures. By now, most of these departments have eliminated the positions they held vacant as a result of those reductions. However, some departments reported that they continue to hold some positions vacant as a result of unallocated reductions that have occurred since the early 1990s. Some departments also reported that they are holding positions vacant because of State budget policies that generally deny departments budget augmentations for merit salary adjustments and inflation adjustments for operating expenses. A Department of Finance document addressing the impact of these budget policies will be released later this month.
- For various reasons, implementation of a new or expanded program occasionally is delayed. These delays result in the positions authorized by the Legislature for the program being held vacant until implementation can proceed. Several departments reported that they experienced a large number of vacancies during 1998-99 as a result of such delays. In some cases, limited-term positions that were authorized for programs during 1998-99 were never filled and have since expired.

Future Trends

Future vacancy rates may decrease because State salaries are becoming more competitive, the restoration of Tier 1 retirement benefits has made State employment more attractive, and many departments are concentrating in filling positions by intensifying recruitment programs. Several departments reported that they are having more success in filling hard-to-hire classifications than they had during 1998-99. They attribute their success to the general salary increases provided to State employees since March 1999,[5] and to pay differentials for specific classifications. Auditors and information technology staff were among those that

[5] State employees generally have received, on average, cumulative salary increases of 9.7 percent since March 1999 (5.5 percent in April/May 1999 and 4 percent in July 1999).

some departments found easier to recruit than in 1998-99. However, at this point, we have no specific data on this point; all our information is anecdotal. In addition, recruitment in certain classifications may continue to be problematic as long as the economy remains robust (e.g., law enforcement, medical) and/or general labor shortages exist (e.g., nursing, teaching).

Countering this trend is the increase in retirements likely to result from the newly enhanced retirement program (2 percent at 55). This creates is likely to result in an increase in lump sum vacation and personal leave program payments that are due employees who leave State service. Most likely, these funds will be obtained by holding positions vacant.

Interpreting the Data

- Data relating to vacant positions within State agencies often are derived from information published in the annual Governor's Budget. However, it is important to understand that the authorized personnel years and the salaries and wages that are printed in the Governor's Budget sometimes are based on estimates that may not prove accurate. The printed Governor's Budget does not take into consideration changes in authorizations or changes in expenditures between January 10, when the Governor's Budget is released, and June 30, when the State's fiscal year ends. This can result in distortions of the data for some departments. This may be the case, for example, for departments that received deficiency appropriations for state operations that were not reflected in the mid-year Governor's Budgets and for departments whose positions are based on population estimates and whose actual populations fell short of the estimate on which their budgeted personnel years were based. Departments with inflexible staffing standards, such as departments that maintain 24-hour-care institutions, adjust their staffing levels to meet the actual population levels. Consequently, a department's excess vacancy rate may appear high or low, in part, because the department's population changed after the Governor's Budget was printed. In the case of departments that received deficiency appropriations, the figures taken from the Governor's Budgets may understate the departments' authorized positions and expenditures, resulting in understated excess vacancy and salary savings rates. In the case of departments whose population estimates were overstated, the figures in the Governor's Budgets overstate the authorized personnel years and expenditures, resulting in overstated excess vacancy and salary savings rates.

  Departments whose budgets reflect a large number of positions associated with variable federal funds or reimbursements also may have somewhat misleading excess vacancy rates if the actual funds received exceed or fall short of the estimate appearing in the Governor's Budget. For the 29 large departments we analyzed, we adjusted the data derived from the printed Governor's Budgets for current-year May Revision population changes where such data were available. May Revision data on population changes, and associated position changes, were available only for the Department of Corrections (for all years except 1989-90), the California Youth Authority (for 1997-98 and 1998-99) and the Employment Development Department (for 1995-6 through 1998-99). We also adjusted all departments' 1997-98 and 1998-99 data for significant increases in expenditure authority that could be identified from changes in departments' 1997-98 and 1998-99

Reconciliations with Appropriations between the January 10 budget and June 30 of the appropriate fiscal year.

We did not adjust the data for revenue that did not materialize. However, we addressed the impact of revenue shortfalls on each department's vacancies in the companion document, which contains our findings pertaining to specific departments. Twenty-two of the 29 departments were affected by revenue shortfalls to some degree during 1998-99. In total, the 22 departments reported revenue shortfalls of about $300 million during 1998-99. Of that amount, about $87 million had been budgeted for salaries and wages. Overall, these shortfalls resulted in 2,024 personnel years being held vacant during 1998-99, accounting for 11 percent of the departments' total vacancies and 20 percent of their excess vacancies during the year. In some cases, the revenue shortfall was large enough to account for 100 percent of the department's excess vacancies. Table 5 shows the impact of the vacancies resulting from revenue shortfalls on each of the 22 departments' excess vacancies, excess vacancy rates, and excess salaries and wages savings. The table also shows the effect of the revenue shortfalls on the excess vacancies, excess vacancy rates and excess salaries and wages savings for the 29 departments overall.

We should note that departments that receive a large amount of federal funds or reimbursements for state operations can reduce their apparent excess vacancies simply by reducing their forecasts of federal funds and reimbursements. If federal revenues and reimbursements materialize at levels that exceed the department forecasts, departments are authorized to use these funds to establish and fill positions during the middle of the fiscal year after notifying the Legislature that additional federal funds or reimbursements are available and explaining the purposes for which the additional funds will be used.[6] However, use of the Section 28 process to add positions as federal funds and reimbursements become available is not without its problems. First, a significant increase in the number of Section 28 notifications adds to the workload of the Legislature and may give legislative staff an insufficient amount of time to review all Section 28 notifications, some of which contain significant issues that merit the Legislature's attention. Second, departments are concerned about the delays inherent in the Section 28 process, which generally requires a 30-day waiting period before the funds may be spent and positions may be filled.

- In general, we believe it is appropriate to use a department's excess vacancy rate and its excess salary savings rate to evaluate its management of vacant positions. However, we found that some departments have extremely high budgeted salary savings rates, in terms of both personnel years and dollars. An example is the Department of Rehabilitation, which has had a budgeted personnel year salary savings rate of between 10.2 percent and 12.3 percent since 1994-95. The budgeted salary savings rate is supposed to reflect the vacancies and salary savings a department will achieve each year through turnover. Unless the department's normal turnover rate is exceptionally high, a high budgeted salary savings rate may indicate problems such as unfunded positions and vacancies caused by factors

[6] This notification is called a "Section 28 notification," after Section 28 of the annual budget act.

other than turnover, problems that in most departments result in excess vacancy and salary savings rates.

- A department's use of temporary help positions can greatly affect its vacancy rate. For example, the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) has consistently had an excess vacancy rate among regular (i.e., non-temporary help) positions of more than 10 percent during the 1990s. However, the DDS hires temporary help positions from registries to fill behind vacant permanent employee positions, and consistently overspends its temporary help authorization. Consequently, its overall excess vacancy rate has been between minus 2 percent and 5.5 percent during the 1990's.

- Overtime is used by many departments to fill vacant positions. This is especially the case in departments that experience recruitment problems and at 24-hour-care institutions. Unbudgeted overtime expenditures frequently are incurred because departments are unable to fill all their positions and must use existing staff to address critical workload that would otherwise be addressed by persons occupying the vacant positions. Although overtime hours substitute for vacant employees, they do not have an associated personnel year value. Consequently, vacancy rates tend to be overstated in departments that make heavy use of overtime, such as the Departments of Corrections, Mental Health, Developmental Services, and Forestry and Fire Protection.

- Some departments that are unable to hire employees to fill vacant positions use contract services to obtain non-State employees who, in essence, fill the vacant positions. However, as in the case of overtime, contract employees do not have an associated personnel year value. Consequently, actual vacancy rates tend to be overstated in departments that make heavy use of contract services, such as the Department of Education.

Recommendations

The Administration is proposing to eliminate 1,736 vacant positions as part of the May Revision of the 2000-01 Governor's Budget. None of the positions proposed for elimination is involved in the provision of public safety, 24-hour care, or health care. Table 6 contains a list of affected departments and the number of positions in each department proposed for elimination. Details are available in the companion document, which contains our findings and recommendations pertaining to specific departments. Together with the 1,840 vacant positions that already have been eliminated since 1998-99, this should reduce the excess vacancies in the 29 departments we reviewed to 3,576. During the fall budget process, the Administration will continue its efforts to minimize excess vacancies by examining the vacant positions in departments that were not part of the present review and by reassessing the vacant positions of the 29 largest departments, based on their 1999-00 success in filling positions that were vacant during 1998-99.

Table 1
History of Vacancy, Excess Vacancy and Salaries and Wages Dollar Savings Rates
State Total, Excluding Higher Education

Year	Total Vacancies	Total Vacancy Rate	Excess Vacancies	Excess Vacancy Rate[1]	Excess Salaries and Wages Savings ($1,000s)	Excess Salaries and Wages Savings Rate[2]
89-90	15,542.0	8.9%	6,628.7	3.8%	$32,587	0.5%
90-91	16,676.3	9.1%	6,917.0	3.8%	$84,877	1.2%
91-92	19,344.1	10.2%	9,450.5	5.0%	$127,388	1.8%
92-93	20,075.4	10.6%	11,873.1	6.3%	$146,521	2.1%
93-94	18,317.5	9.5%	9,487.6	4.9%	$128,955	1.7%
94-95	17,627.5	9.0%	7,384.9	3.8%	$62,349	0.8%
95-96	19,372.6	9.8%	9,269.7	4.7%	$184,032	2.1%
96-97	17,454.7	8.9%	7,785.9	4.0%	$141,938	1.6%
97-98	21,209.1	10.5%	11,924.2	5.9%	$230,956	2.6%
98-99	21,790.1	10.5%	11,961.9	5.8%	$205,259	2.2%
10-Year Average		9.7%		4.8%		1.7%

[1] Based on total authorized positions
[2] Based on total authorized salaries and wages

Table 2
History of Vacancy, Excess Vacancy and Salaries and Wages Dollar Savings Rates
29 Large State Departments

Year	Total Vacancies	Total Vacancy Rate	Excess Vacancies	Excess Vacancy Rate[1]	Excess Salaries and Wages Savings ($1,000s)	Excess Salaries and Wages Savings Rate[2]
89-90	13,522.0	8.8%	5,326.4	3.5%	$15,566	0.3%
90-91	15,029.4	9.3%	6,139.4	3.8%	$50,063	0.9%
91-92	17,140.1	10.4%	8,287.1	5.0%	$74,334	1.2%
92-93	17,794.9	10.7%	10,465.5	6.3%	$104,891	1.8%
93-94	16,240.5	9.6%	8,228.7	4.9%	$84,504	1.3%
94-95	15,361.1	9.0%	6,084.1	3.6%	$1,105	0.0%
95-96	16,896.7	9.8%	7,756.6	4.5%	$122,876	1.7%
96-97	15,041.6	8.7%	6,250.8	3.6%	$106,075	1.5%
97-98	18,710.2	10.6%	10,531.5	5.9%	$201,198	2.6%
98-99	18,742.7	10.3%	9,890.8	5.4%	$246,878	3.0%
10-Year Average		9.7%		4.7%		1.4%

Data for 1997-98 and 1998-99 have been adjusted for significant changes between January 10 and June 30. Data for other years have been adjusted for workload changes in the Employment Development Department and populations changes for the Department of Corrections.

[1] Based on total authorized positions
[2] Based on total authorized salaries and wages

Table 3
Ten-Year Average Vacancy Rates of 29 Large Departments

Department	Ten-year Average Vacancy Rate
Water Resources Control Board	18.1%
Department of Industrial Relations	15.9%
Department of Insurance	15.4%
Department of Health Service	15.2%
Department of Justice	14.3%
Department of Toxic Substances Control	14.2%
Department of Education	14.0%
State Controller	12.0%
Employment Development Department	11.9%
Department of Mental Health	11.9%
Department of General Services	11.6%
Department of Rehabilitation	11.5%
Department of Social Services	11.4%
Department of Food and Agriculture	11.2%
Department of Corrections	10.5%
Department of Fish and Game	10.2%
Department of Motor Vehicles	10.0%
Department of Consumer Affairs	9.4%
Department of Veterans Affairs	8.3%
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	8.2%
California Youth Authority	8.1%
Department of Developmental Services	7.5%
Board of Equalization	6.7%
Department of Transportation	6.6%
Department of Water Resources	6.5%
California Highway Patrol	6.2%
Franchise Tax Board	6.0%
Air Resources Board	4.3%
Department of Parks and Recreation	4.3%

Table 4
Components of Vacancies and Salaries and Wages Savings
29 Large Departments, 1998-99

	Personnel Years (PYs) or PY Equivalents	Dollars ($1,000s)	Percent
Total Vacancies	**18,742.7**	**$811,872**	**100%**
Positions Vacant to Cover Budgeted Salary Savings	8,851.9	$381,742	47%
Excess Vacancies	**9,890.8**	**$430,130**	**53%**
Positions Vacant to Cover Excess Cost of Filled Positions	3,464.3	$149,252	18%
Positions Vacant to Cover Cost of Excess Overtime	2,803.6	$122,864	15%
Positions Vacant Due to Revenue Shortfalls	2,024.1	$87,365	11%
Vacancies that Result in Real Dollar Savings that can be Redirected or Reverted	**1,598.8**	**$70,649**	**9%**
Salaries and Wages Savings Associated with Unspent Overtime Budgets and Filling Positions at Lower Salaries than Budgeted	--	$88,864	
Net Excess Vacancies and Excess Salaries and Wages	**1,598.8**	**$159,513**	
Amount of Excess S&W Savings Redirected to Operating Expenses and Equipment	--	$42,579	
Amount of Excess S&W Savings Redirected to Staff Benefits	--	$14,275	
Amount of Excess S&W Savings Redirected to Special Items of Expense	--	$21,115	
Amount of Excess S&W Savings Reverted or Reappropriated	**1,598.8**	**$81,544**	

Table 5
Impact of Revenue Shortfalls on Excess Vacancies and Excess Salaries and Wages Savings

	Excess Vacancies		Excess Vacancy Rates		Excess Salaries and Wages Savings	
Department	Including Revenue Shortfall Positions	Excluding Revenue Shortfall Positions	Including Revenue Shortfall Positions	Excluding Revenue Shortfall Positions	Including Revenue Shortfall Positions	Excluding Revenue Shortfall Positions
Department of Justice	544.7	438.0	10.3%	8.5%	$14,324	$9,372
State Controller's Office	106.8	17.4	8.4%	1.5%	$3,079	-$511
Board of Equalization	146.0	116.1	3.6%	2.9%	$3,114	$1,329
Department of Consumer Affairs	424.3	352.0	13.4%	11.4%	$15,004	$13,138
Franchise Tax Board	84.8	10.2	1.5%	0.2%	$5,314	$2,713
Department of Transportation	729.8	-3.2	3.5%	-0.1%	$89,830	$56,858
California Highway Patrol	279.4	274.4	2.7%	2.7%	$3,197	$2,786
Dept. of Forestry and Fire Protection	255.5	77.0	4.9%	1.5%	$3,513	-$6,967
Department of Fish and Game	144.2	111.5	6.3%	4.9%	$3,737	$2,156
Department of Parks and Recreation	29.9	-16.3	1.0%	-0.6%	-$2,752	-$4,393
Department of Water Resources	188.0	166.5	6.4%	5.7%	$5,809	$4,695
Water Resources Control Board	146.5	91.0	10.5%	6.3%	$6,319	$3,245
Dept. of Toxic Substances Control	160.1	111.7	14.3%	10.4%	$5,246	$2,921
Department of Health Services	504.1	471.1	9.2%	8.6%	$14,862	$13,279
Dept. of Developmental Services	-146.7	-153.3	-1.9%	-2.0%	$4,663	$4,369
Department of Mental Health	675.7	647.4	8.2%	7.9%	$9,916	$9,146
Employment Development Dept.	1,483.9	1,098.4	12.4%	9.5%	$33,689	$20,969
Department of Social Services	262.7	252.3	5.6%	5.4%	$8,652	$8,182
Department of Corrections	2,105.1	2,070.0	4.6%	4.5%	-$16,106	-$17,746
Department of Education	180.9	173.4	7.1%	6.8%	$8,583	$8,183
Department of Industrial Relations	207.4	201.7	7.7%	7.5%	$8,340	$8,050
Department of Food and Agriculture	264.5	187.1	13.4%	9.8%	$4,517	$3,711
29 Large Departments	**9,890.8**	**7,866.7**	**5.4%**	**4.3%**	**$246,878**	**$159,513**

Table 6
Vacant Positions to be Eliminated

Department of Justice	144.1
Department of Consumer Affairs	44.3
Department of General Services	93.8
Department of Motor Vehicles	241.1
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection	215.0
Department of Fish and Game	106.0
Department of Water Resources	65.8
Water Resources Control Board	5.0
Department of Toxic Substances Control	25.0
Department of Health Services	145.3
Department of Mental Health	50.0
Department of Rehabilitation	3.0
Department of Social Services	150.0
Department of Corrections	300.0
California Youth Authority	66.5
Department of Industrial Relations	31.0
Department of Food and Agriculture	50.0